

LATIN

Paper 0480/12
Language

Key messages

- Candidates should be familiar with the Defined Vocabulary List (DVL) found in the syllabus. The various English equivalents in the DVL should also be known and understood. Credit will generally be given for accurate and appropriate translation, e.g. *contendo* sometimes but not always 'hurry' or 'stretch'; this year 'fight' was the better translation.
- Candidates should be encouraged to attempt a translation of every word in **Question 1**, and not to leave gaps in their translations: a gap will never be creditworthy.
- In their answers to comprehension questions, candidates should adhere strictly to the lemma.

General comments

Candidates must follow the rubric for each question and sub-question. The translation must be written on alternate lines of lined pages, with margin, and answers to the comprehension questions should be correctly identified and approached in the correct order. Candidates should not write their answers on the question paper.

The majority of candidates endeavour to follow the instructions and to make a good attempt to render the Latin passage for translation into sensible modern English; generally, they demonstrate thoughtful and accurate understanding in the comprehension section.

In terms of administration

- a 4-page answer booklet is usually sufficient for this paper
- candidates' scripts should be returned in the correct numerical order
- please return candidates' scripts only: no question papers, please.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Translation

It should be known that, in general, nouns, adjectives and adverbs are worth 1 mark each (although these must be seen to be understood in their correct number and case, and in the case of adjectives, they must be seen to be understood to apply to the correct noun by grammatical agreement). There are two marks available for most verbs (vocabulary + tense and/or voice). Certain more advanced constructions may be treated slightly differently, for example the ablative absolute construction is generally taken as a single unit, worth three marks, thus allowing for vocabulary, tense and co-ordination with the rest of the sentence.

Note should be taken of the following common errors:

- *[Caesar] ipse consul fieret* means '[Caesar] would himself become consul' or 'be made' – not 'make himself' (*se faceret*, or, more correctly, *se crearet*)
- *hoc vetito* (and, later, *quo conspecto*): for full credit, candidates needed to co-ordinate the ablative absolute with the rest of the sentence, i.e., 'after this had been forbidden ...' is better than 'this was forbidden and ...'
- *senatus* and *senator* are different words

- in this passage, the full force of *suam patriam*, 'his own homeland' needed to be recognised
- oppugno* means to 'attack', not to 'fight', nor to 'fight with', nor even to 'fight against'
- vincere* is too often translated only as 'to win'. This translation is incorrect when the verb is used transitively or in the passive voice: *Caesar victus est* does not mean 'Caesar won', nor even 'Caesar was won'. Only 'Caesar was conquered/defeated' is acceptable here. Later, though, 'Caesar said that Pompey didn't know how to win' (*vincere*) is perfectly good.
- Caesar effugit* might have meant that Caesar 'fled', but the following phrase makes it clear that he in fact 'escaped'.
- potuisse superari* is a difficult phrase to translate, because English works differently from Latin. Each word is deemed to be worth two marks in the Mark Scheme; or, rather, the phrase is worth four in total: one mark each for knowledge of vocabulary; one mark for a perfect tense; one mark for a passive voice: the best English rendering has Caesar saying that 'only on that day was he able (1) to have (1) been (1) overpowered (1)'
- tot* does not mean 'all'; *melior* does not mean 'best'
- for *petivit*, again, candidates need to understand that Caesar 'made for' Alexandria ('sought', even 'attacked' were also allowed); however, he did not 'ask' Alexandria.

Question 2

Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice to candidates is that they should read the questions carefully, observe the marks available for each, answer them in the order they appear on the paper (which will help to guide them through the passage), and adhere strictly to the lemma for each question. It is important that candidates remember that while this is not simply another passage for full translation, and that a certain leeway is granted with, for example, verb tenses, participial expression, active/passive reversal etc., nevertheless the questions deliberately direct candidates to the lemma because the answers to the questions are to be found in the lemma (and only in the lemma). In general, candidates should not expect to gain credit for words that appear in the questions themselves or are glossed as vocabulary items on the question paper.

Question 2(a)(i) and (ii) were generally done well. The main differentiator was the understanding that Quinctius gave his orders after he and his troops had moved (not while they were moving) to Thebes. For an understanding of what it was Quinctius ordered his men to build, 'rampart' was required for *vallum* (as it appears in the DVL); in later questions, variations on the idea of 'defences' were allowed.

Question 2(b) is a useful example of a question in which some candidates did not sufficiently observe the lemma: many earned marks for their understanding of the fact that Macedonians and Greeks used leafy trees, but not all went on to explain that these were too leafy for soldiers to carry along with their weapons. Taking careful note of the lemma and of the marks available for the question would have helped some candidates here.

Question 2(c) was done well, although some representation of *poterat* was required for full marks.

Livy's text as interrogated by **Question 2(d)** was also generally well understood, although it was not always clear to candidates that an approach, like a gate, was created, rather than revealed, by the removal of the tree trunks used by the Macedonians and Greeks.

For full marks in **Question 2(e)(ii)**, candidates needed to recognise both the prefix and the passive nature of *pervideri*: too many thought that nobody could see the Romans, or (better, but still not quite correct), that the Romans' branches couldn't be seen.

Question 2 (g) provides a good example of a high-tariff question for which it is essential that candidates address the whole lemma. A perfect word-for-word translation is not required, but clear understanding of the whole lemma must be demonstrated if all the marks are to be achieved.

As usual, the derivations, **Question 2(h)**, were done well, with military, major, facility and location all making regular appearances. Centres are reminded that only the first four derivations will be accepted by Examiners. Correct English spelling of each derived word is required.

LATIN

Paper 0480/13
Language

Key messages

- Candidates should be familiar with the Defined Vocabulary List (DVL) found in the syllabus. The various English equivalents in the DVL should also be known and understood. Credit will generally be given for accurate and appropriate translation, e.g. *contendo* sometimes but not always 'hurry' or 'stretch'; this year 'fight' was the better translation.
- Candidates should be encouraged to attempt a translation of every word in **Question 1**, and not to leave gaps in their translations: a gap will never be creditworthy.
- In their answers to comprehension questions, candidates should adhere strictly to the lemma.

General comments

Candidates must follow the rubric for each question and sub-question. The translation must be written on alternate lines of lined pages, with margin, and answers to the comprehension questions should be correctly identified and approached in the correct order. Candidates should not write their answers on the question paper.

The majority of candidates endeavour to follow the instructions and to make a good attempt to render the Latin passage for translation into sensible modern English; generally, they demonstrate thoughtful and accurate understanding in the comprehension section.

In terms of administration

- a 4-page answer booklet is usually sufficient for this paper
- candidates' scripts should be returned in the correct numerical order
- please return candidates' scripts only: no question papers, please.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Translation

It should be known that, in general, nouns, adjectives and adverbs are worth 1 mark each (although these must be seen to be understood in their correct number and case, and in the case of adjectives, they must be seen to be understood to apply to the correct noun by grammatical agreement). There are two marks available for most verbs (vocabulary + tense and/or voice). Certain more advanced constructions may be treated slightly differently, for example the ablative absolute construction is generally taken as a single unit, worth three marks, thus allowing for vocabulary, tense and co-ordination with the rest of the sentence.

Note should be taken of the following common errors:

- *[Caesar] ipse consul fieret* means '[Caesar] would himself become consul' or 'be made' – not 'make himself' (*se faceret*, or, more correctly, *se crearet*)
- *hoc vetito* (and, later, *quo conspecto*): for full credit, candidates needed to co-ordinate the ablative absolute with the rest of the sentence, i.e., 'after this had been forbidden ...' is better than 'this was forbidden and ...'
- *senatus* and *senator* are different words

- in this passage, the full force of *suam patriam*, 'his own homeland' needed to be recognised
- oppugno* means to 'attack', not to 'fight', nor to 'fight with', nor even to 'fight against'
- vincere* is too often translated only as 'to win'. This translation is incorrect when the verb is used transitively or in the passive voice: *Caesar victus est* does not mean 'Caesar won', nor even 'Caesar was won'. Only 'Caesar was conquered/defeated' is acceptable here. Later, though, 'Caesar said that Pompey didn't know how to win' (*vincere*) is perfectly good.
- Caesar effugit* might have meant that Caesar 'fled', but the following phrase makes it clear that he in fact 'escaped'.
- potuisse superari* is a difficult phrase to translate, because English works differently from Latin. Each word is deemed to be worth two marks in the Mark Scheme; or, rather, the phrase is worth four in total: one mark each for knowledge of vocabulary; one mark for a perfect tense; one mark for a passive voice: the best English rendering has Caesar saying that 'only on that day was he able (1) to have (1) been (1) overpowered (1)'
- tot* does not mean 'all'; *melior* does not mean 'best'
- for *petivit*, again, candidates need to understand that Caesar 'made for' Alexandria ('sought', even 'attacked' were also allowed); however, he did not 'ask' Alexandria.

Question 2

Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice to candidates is that they should read the questions carefully, observe the marks available for each, answer them in the order they appear on the paper (which will help to guide them through the passage), and adhere strictly to the lemma for each question. It is important that candidates remember that while this is not simply another passage for full translation, and that a certain leeway is granted with, for example, verb tenses, participial expression, active/passive reversal etc., nevertheless the questions deliberately direct candidates to the lemma because the answers to the questions are to be found in the lemma (and only in the lemma). In general, candidates should not expect to gain credit for words that appear in the questions themselves or are glossed as vocabulary items on the question paper.

Question 2(a)(i) and (ii) were generally done well. The main differentiator was the understanding that Quinctius gave his orders after he and his troops had moved (not while they were moving) to Thebes. For an understanding of what it was Quinctius ordered his men to build, 'rampart' was required for *vallum* (as it appears in the DVL); in later questions, variations on the idea of 'defences' were allowed.

Question 2(b) is a useful example of a question in which some candidates did not sufficiently observe the lemma: many earned marks for their understanding of the fact that Macedonians and Greeks used leafy trees, but not all went on to explain that these were too leafy for soldiers to carry along with their weapons. Taking careful note of the lemma and of the marks available for the question would have helped some candidates here.

Question 2(c) was done well, although some representation of *poterat* was required for full marks.

Livy's text as interrogated by **Question 2(d)** was also generally well understood, although it was not always clear to candidates that an approach, like a gate, was created, rather than revealed, by the removal of the tree trunks used by the Macedonians and Greeks.

For full marks in **Question 2(e)(ii)**, candidates needed to recognise both the prefix and the passive nature of *pervideri*: too many thought that nobody could see the Romans, or (better, but still not quite correct), that the Romans' branches couldn't be seen.

Question 2 (g) provides a good example of a high-tariff question for which it is essential that candidates address the whole lemma. A perfect word-for-word translation is not required, but clear understanding of the whole lemma must be demonstrated if all the marks are to be achieved.

As usual, the derivations, **Question 2(h)**, were done well, with military, major, facility and location all making regular appearances. Centres are reminded that only the first four derivations will be accepted by Examiners. Correct English spelling of each derived word is required.

LATIN

Paper 0480/22

Literature

Key messages

- Candidates should be able to demonstrate a personal response to the literature
- An area for improvement is scansion. Some candidates did not attempt this question.
- Candidates should look at the marks available for each question to guide their responses.
- Literary analysis is required in response to style questions.

General comments

In general, candidates demonstrated a sound comprehension of the works of Virgil and Cicero. Many candidates translated the prescribed texts with accurate fluency and responded confidently to the greater part of the questions. Examiners would remind candidates that it is helpful to answer the questions in the order in which they are written on the examination paper and to number them accurately. Candidates should read the questions carefully to identify style questions. For the questions asking for reference to **both** what the author says and **how** he says it, it is not adequate for candidates simply to translate two phrases and there must be some element of literary analysis. Performance on scansion was weaker this year.

Candidates engaged well with the verse and prose selections and demonstrated the ability to analyse both the style and content of the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature. Candidates should be reminded to look at the marks available for a question to ensure they are making a suitable number of points. Examination technique was reasonable on the shorter questions, while the 10 mark questions were approached with less assurance. A long introduction is not required for a 10 mark question. A good range of points directly related to the question is needed. Each point should be supported with a specific reference to the set text in English or in Latin and there needs to be relevant discussion and evaluation of each item.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Virgil, *Aeneid* Book 3

Question 1

(a) Generally the first question was answered well; there were enough possible points here that most candidates attained 3 marks.

(b) Few candidates scanned the whole line correctly. Some candidates did not know how to mark long and short syllables (although where they had made up their own system and provided a key, it was accepted) and many did not mark the divisions between the feet. In future, candidates should take care to notice when vowels are part of diphthongs and when they are not, as well as remembering that –que is always a short syllable. The most common error was to get 'asque met|u liq' the wrong way round: spondee dactyl when it should have been dactyl then spondee.

(c) This question was answered fairly well although a recurring mistake was to pick a suitable feature but to be too vague about the effectiveness. An example of a good answer would be: **1ci** simile/comparison **1cii** there is no plague more savage and a plague is a terrible thing so this emphasises that the Harpies must be extremely terrible.

- (d) Candidates needed to engage with the word 'disgusting'. Acceptable answers referred to hooked hands, and very foul discharge from the stomach.
- (e) Answered appositely, with most candidates giving a confident translation. There were many interesting renderings of *nullo custode*. Common errors were to omit to translate *delati* and *ecce*.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates were able to name Dawn, although suitable synonyms such as 'first light' or 'sunrise' were acceptable. 'The morning star' and 'Aurora Borealis' were not appropriate.
- (b) This question was approached with assurance by those who had studied the set text carefully; some missed out one or more of the elements e.g. *macie confecta suprema* or *miserandaque cultu*.
- (c) On the whole, candidates answered this question confidently, with most following the instruction to quote the Latin. The unkempt beard and clothes held together with thorns were the most popular items discussed.
- (d) Although a few candidates thought they were just being asked to translate *haesit*, most candidates understood that Achemenides hesitated because he was frightened of the Trojan weapons, since he was a Greek and their enemy.
- (e) A good many candidates were able to identify the request to take him with them or equivalent for (i) although some went outside of the lemma, remembering that he also says he'd rather be killed by a human, and they talked about this. For (ii) most identified the begging and praying or discussed the different things he swears upon; a minority explained (ii) contextually – 'he is even willing to go to his enemies' etc. – rather than focusing on the lines given, which could not be credited.

Question 3

In general, this question was well answered. Apart from a minority who misunderstood the location of the word 'only' in the sentence and discussed who else Virgil makes us feel sympathetic for, the larger part of the cohort was able to remember a wealth of specific details about the Cyclops and express how the details made them feel – the best answers gave a balance: not merely stating 'this makes us sympathetic/not sympathetic' but explaining why, or how it made them feel disgusted, terrified etc. A Level 3 answer requires a good range of appropriate points using specific details from the set text with clear and detailed explanation as well as detailed analysis of evidence. Candidates achieved Level 1 or 2 marks by giving imprecise responses to the question with some or minimal engagement with specific aspects of the text. The most successful responses argued both sides of the question and supported each point with a precise example from the text studied.

Section B: Introducing Cicero

Question 4

- (a) Responses showed that candidates frequently knew what these lines meant though many lost marks by ignoring 'how he says it' and not referring to style in their answer. Although Latin quotation was not necessary for this question, it was a quicker route to gaining the marks: candidates should be encouraged to quote short relevant Latin phrases to support their answers in this type of question. Reference to content was acceptable for 2 marks, but for full credit candidates were required to refer to the type of language used, for example the repetition of superlatives *summa* and *maxima*.
- (b) Most candidates were able to translate fluently into good English. The *sane* and the *perscriptum* were frequently left out. In a small number of cases there was confusion as to how to express *basι* in English: 'base' and 'pedestal' are suitable alternatives but 'basement' is not a synonym of these.
- (c) Almost every candidate was able to identify that the statue was the first thing shown to Cicero when he became quaestor.
- (d) Translations of *arcum* and *facem* were wide-ranging, with attempts to render the words in English generously credited (i.e. arc and arch. Many knew that Diana was the goddess of hunting, very few

knew that she was the goddess of the moon. A common error was to make her the goddess of 'haunting' but this was accepted as a spelling mistake.

Question 5

- (a) There was some confusion on this question. For (i), many thought Verres was the patron, reflecting misunderstanding of the set text. In (ii) a significant number of candidates did not recognise this as a generic question and stated that the patron should return the statue. (iii) was generally known, although a minority had given P. Africanus' name as the patron, despite being able to answer correctly. The full name was not required: Scipio was enough.
- (b) Knowledge of this section of the text seemed much weaker, and many candidates were unsure who was being addressed at this point, or what the words were. A lot of answers wrongly took *hoc Verrem* together and very few addressed the 'how' part of the question. Here again, Latin quotation would have gained higher marks in many responses. The hendiadys with a quotation was the most frequently seen way to gain the style marks.
- (c) In some cases, the section was translated fluently with all parts included, although there was a tendency to omit the last part about recovering it from the house of a robber. The rendering in English of *religionem* and *generi* was something that some candidates found difficult.
- (d) The vast majority of candidates spotted the rhetorical question. Candidates who merely said 'repetition of aut' did not get a mark, as *aut... aut...* is a standard phrase, though if they focused on the balanced phrasing this was sufficient. Three techniques were required, but there was no need to discuss them at length.

Question 6

Answers to 10 mark questions need not be long, but should give a range of specific details or quotations (in English or Latin) from the texts to support an argument, rather than dealing in generalisations or giving extended introductions which have no relation to the question.

The most successful answers outlined examples of when Cicero was talking about Verres' terrible behaviour and its effect on others, using specific references to the speech, and then discussed whether Cicero was making light of it for the sake of entertaining the audience. Some seemed unsure as to what Verres' crimes were even in just this section of the text. Of those who did know the speech, some were not clear on what it would really look like to focus on the nature of the crimes: they used general attacks on Verres' personality, digressions on the statue/origins of Sicily, calling him 'iste' etc. as evidence of Cicero not ignoring the crimes, although these pieces of evidence might have been more suited to arguing that Cicero did ignore his crimes. Candidates were credited for discussing other elements which make Cicero's speech entertaining.

LATIN

Paper 0480/23
Literature

Key messages

- Candidates should be able to demonstrate a personal response to the literature
- An area for improvement is scansion. Some candidates did not attempt this question.
- Candidates should look at the marks available for each question to guide their responses.
- Literary analysis is required in response to style questions.

General comments

In general, candidates demonstrated a sound comprehension of the works of Virgil and Cicero. Many candidates translated the prescribed texts with accurate fluency and responded confidently to the greater part of the questions. Examiners would remind candidates that it is helpful to answer the questions in the order in which they are written on the examination paper and to number them accurately. Candidates should read the questions carefully to identify style questions. For the questions asking for reference to **both** what the author says and **how** he says it, it is not adequate for candidates simply to translate two phrases and there must be some element of literary analysis. Performance on scansion was weaker this year.

Candidates engaged well with the verse and prose selections and demonstrated the ability to analyse both the style and content of the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature. Candidates should be reminded to look at the marks available for a question to ensure they are making a suitable number of points. Examination technique was reasonable on the shorter questions, while the 10 mark questions were approached with less assurance. A long introduction is not required for a 10 mark question. A good range of points directly related to the question is needed. Each point should be supported with a specific reference to the set text in English or in Latin and there needs to be relevant discussion and evaluation of each item.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Virgil, *Aeneid* Book 3

Question 1

(a) Generally the first question was answered well; there were enough possible points here that most candidates attained 3 marks.

(b) Few candidates scanned the whole line correctly. Some candidates did not know how to mark long and short syllables (although where they had made up their own system and provided a key, it was accepted) and many did not mark the divisions between the feet. In future, candidates should take care to notice when vowels are part of diphthongs and when they are not, as well as remembering that –que is always a short syllable. The most common error was to get 'asque met|u liq' the wrong way round: spondee dactyl when it should have been dactyl then spondee.

(c) This question was answered fairly well although a recurring mistake was to pick a suitable feature but to be too vague about the effectiveness. An example of a good answer would be: **1ci** simile/comparison **1cii** there is no plague more savage and a plague is a terrible thing so this emphasises that the Harpies must be extremely terrible.

- (d) Candidates needed to engage with the word 'disgusting'. Acceptable answers referred to hooked hands, and very foul discharge from the stomach.
- (e) Answered appositely, with most candidates giving a confident translation. There were many interesting renderings of *nullo custode*. Common errors were to omit to translate *delati* and *ecce*.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates were able to name Dawn, although suitable synonyms such as 'first light' or 'sunrise' were acceptable. 'The morning star' and 'Aurora Borealis' were not appropriate.
- (b) This question was approached with assurance by those who had studied the set text carefully; some missed out one or more of the elements e.g. *macie confecta suprema* or *miserandaque cultu*.
- (c) On the whole, candidates answered this question confidently, with most following the instruction to quote the Latin. The unkempt beard and clothes held together with thorns were the most popular items discussed.
- (d) Although a few candidates thought they were just being asked to translate *haesit*, most candidates understood that Achemenides hesitated because he was frightened of the Trojan weapons, since he was a Greek and their enemy.
- (e) A good many candidates were able to identify the request to take him with them or equivalent for (i) although some went outside of the lemma, remembering that he also says he'd rather be killed by a human, and they talked about this. For (ii) most identified the begging and praying or discussed the different things he swears upon; a minority explained (ii) contextually – 'he is even willing to go to his enemies' etc. – rather than focusing on the lines given, which could not be credited.

Question 3

In general, this question was well answered. Apart from a minority who misunderstood the location of the word 'only' in the sentence and discussed who else Virgil makes us feel sympathetic for, the larger part of the cohort was able to remember a wealth of specific details about the Cyclops and express how the details made them feel – the best answers gave a balance: not merely stating 'this makes us sympathetic/not sympathetic' but explaining why, or how it made them feel disgusted, terrified etc. A Level 3 answer requires a good range of appropriate points using specific details from the set text with clear and detailed explanation as well as detailed analysis of evidence. Candidates achieved Level 1 or 2 marks by giving imprecise responses to the question with some or minimal engagement with specific aspects of the text. The most successful responses argued both sides of the question and supported each point with a precise example from the text studied.

Section B: Introducing Cicero

Question 4

- (a) Responses showed that candidates frequently knew what these lines meant though many lost marks by ignoring 'how he says it' and not referring to style in their answer. Although Latin quotation was not necessary for this question, it was a quicker route to gaining the marks: candidates should be encouraged to quote short relevant Latin phrases to support their answers in this type of question. Reference to content was acceptable for 2 marks, but for full credit candidates were required to refer to the type of language used, for example the repetition of superlatives *summa* and *maxima*.
- (b) Most candidates were able to translate fluently into good English. The *sane* and the *perscriptum* were frequently left out. In a small number of cases there was confusion as to how to express *basι* in English: 'base' and 'pedestal' are suitable alternatives but 'basement' is not a synonym of these.
- (c) Almost every candidate was able to identify that the statue was the first thing shown to Cicero when he became quaestor.
- (d) Translations of *arcum* and *facem* were wide-ranging, with attempts to render the words in English generously credited (i.e. arc and arch. Many knew that Diana was the goddess of hunting, very few

knew that she was the goddess of the moon. A common error was to make her the goddess of 'haunting' but this was accepted as a spelling mistake.

Question 5

- (a) There was some confusion on this question. For (i), many thought Verres was the patron, reflecting misunderstanding of the set text. In (ii) a significant number of candidates did not recognise this as a generic question and stated that the patron should return the statue. (iii) was generally known, although a minority had given P. Africanus' name as the patron, despite being able to answer correctly. The full name was not required: Scipio was enough.
- (b) Knowledge of this section of the text seemed much weaker, and many candidates were unsure who was being addressed at this point, or what the words were. A lot of answers wrongly took *hoc Verrem* together and very few addressed the 'how' part of the question. Here again, Latin quotation would have gained higher marks in many responses. The hendiadys with a quotation was the most frequently seen way to gain the style marks.
- (c) In some cases, the section was translated fluently with all parts included, although there was a tendency to omit the last part about recovering it from the house of a robber. The rendering in English of *religionem* and *generi* was something that some candidates found difficult.
- (d) The vast majority of candidates spotted the rhetorical question. Candidates who merely said 'repetition of aut' did not get a mark, as *aut... aut...* is a standard phrase, though if they focused on the balanced phrasing this was sufficient. Three techniques were required, but there was no need to discuss them at length.

Question 6

Answers to 10 mark questions need not be long, but should give a range of specific details or quotations (in English or Latin) from the texts to support an argument, rather than dealing in generalisations or giving extended introductions which have no relation to the question.

The most successful answers outlined examples of when Cicero was talking about Verres' terrible behaviour and its effect on others, using specific references to the speech, and then discussed whether Cicero was making light of it for the sake of entertaining the audience. Some seemed unsure as to what Verres' crimes were even in just this section of the text. Of those who did know the speech, some were not clear on what it would really look like to focus on the nature of the crimes: they used general attacks on Verres' personality, digressions on the statue/origins of Sicily, calling him 'iste' etc. as evidence of Cicero not ignoring the crimes, although these pieces of evidence might have been more suited to arguing that Cicero did ignore his crimes. Candidates were credited for discussing other elements which make Cicero's speech entertaining.